

Amendments to the Drawings:

The accompanying Replacement Sheet for the Figure includes text in the boxes of the figure. No new matter has been added, and the Replacement Sheet is supported by the present application, including the specification. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Attachments: 1 Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS

Claims 12 to 22 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for indicating that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO 1449 paper and cited references.

The Figure was objected to and has been amended. No new matter has been added, and the Replacement Sheet is supported by the present application, including the specification. Approval and entry of Replacement Sheet is respectfully requested, as is withdrawal of the drawing objection.

The Specification was objected to and has been amended. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 to 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,335 to "Ide."

As regards the anticipation rejections of the claims, to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (*See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As explained herein, it is respectfully submitted that the prior Office Action does not meet this standard, for example, as to all of the features of the claims. Still further, not only must each of the claim features be identically described, an anticipatory reference must also enable a person having ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed subject matter. (*See Akzo, N.V. v. U.S.I.T.C.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986)).

Claim 12 includes the feature of detecting an acceleration value **in a z direction** while simultaneously generating a corresponding second signal, in which the z direction is a **vertical direction**. The "Ide" reference refers to a left acceleration sensor 40L, a right acceleration sensor 40R, and a center acceleration sensor 30. The sensors detects acceleration caused at a fixed position when the car crashes against an obstruction. Acceleration experienced by the car during a crash is in the forward, or x direction. Thus, none of the sensors in the "Ide" reference detect acceleration in a **z** or **vertical direction**, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter.

Claims 12 to 20 depend from claim 12, as presented, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12, as presented.

Claim 21 includes features similar to claim 12, as presented, and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 12, as presented. Claim 22 depends from claim 21, as presented, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21, as presented.

In summary, all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP


Dated: 8/31/2007

By: 

Gerard A. Messina
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway
New York, NY 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646


33,825
Aaron C.
D E D I R A